

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/756,880

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 8 has been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. The claims have been amended to remove any ambiguities.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 10 are rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Boileau.

Claim 6 is rejected under §103(a) as being obvious in view of Boileau.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under §103(a) as being obvious over Boileau in view of EP '977.

Analysis

Claim 1 is presently the only independent claim; therefore, the following discussion is initially directed to this independent claim.

Claim 1 is directed to a pneumatic tire which has a reinforcing cord layer arranged at a side face zone ranging from the bead portion to the sidewall portion, in which the reinforcing cord layer is a layer of one or more rubberized cords spirally wound about an axial line of the tire and has an inner end in a radial direction of the tire between a position located outward from an outer periphery of the bead core in the radial direction and a position located inward from a tapered end of the bead filler rubber in the radial direction.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/756,880

As described on paragraphs [0025] to [0031] of this application, the present invention defines a relationship between the bead filler rubber and the reinforcing cord layer to be arranged for taking the balance among rigidity in radial direction, rigidity in lateral direction and rigidity in longitudinal direction in order to achieve the reduction of the rolling resistance and the improvement of the steering stability.

In Boileau, the interposed rubber layer 18 is arranged between the carcass 6 and the sidewall reinforcement 14, 15. However, the rubber of the layer 18 has a modulus (325 g/mm² at 100% elongation) lower than that (390 g/mm² at 100% elongation) of the calendering (or coating) rubber for the carcass and the sidewall reinforcement as described on column 4, lines 1 to 32, which is said to serve as a cushion rubber. It is common sense by those skilled in the art that rubber softer than the coating rubber is not a bead filler rubber. Therefore, the interposed rubber layer 18 described in Boileau is entirely different from the bead filler rubber defined in the present invention.

Further, the inner end of the sidewall reinforcement in the radial direction described in Boileau is located to the side of the bead core. This is a completely different arrangement than the positioning recited in claim 1, wherein the inner end of the sidewall reinforcement in the radial direction of the tire is between a position located outward from an outer periphery of the bead core in the radial direction.

In any case, Boileau discloses only the tire construction having no bead filler rubber and does not utterly teach not suggest the relationship between the bead filler rubber and the reinforcing cord layer to be arranged for taking the balance among rigidity in the radial direction,

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/756,880

rigidity in the lateral direction and rigidity in the longitudinal direction. Therefore, Boileau does not anticipate claim 1.

In addition, the Examiner notes (page 11 of Office Action) that FR '988 and Delia et al. also anticipate or render at least claim 1 obvious. Although these references were cited but not applied, Applicant provides the following comments for distinguishing the present invention from these other references.

Delias merely discloses the reinforcements 6 arranged in the circumferential direction and formed on groups 63 of at least four assembly sections 65, which is entirely different from the reinforcing layer defined in the present invention.

FR '988 merely discloses the arrangement of the reinforcing layer in the circumferential direction but does not teach or suggest the relationship to the bead filler as defined in the present invention.

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/756,880

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen R. Smith
Registration No. 43,042

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: February 24, 2003

Attorney Docket No.: Q62522